UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Make Mine Democracy - - *J. Ray Shute*

The Nature and Substance of Man - - - - - - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

No Need for Apology - *William P. Jenkins*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVII NUMBER 3

Chicago, July-August, 1951

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Channing M. Briggs: Instructor in Sociology and Group Work, George Williams College, Chicago.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

William P. Jenkins: Minister of The First Unitarian Congregation of Toronto.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

Philip Schug: Minister of All Souls Unitarian Society, Lincoln, Nebraska.

J. Ray Shute: Mayor of Monroe, North Carolina.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 39

ARTICLES—
- Make Mine Democracy—J. RAY SHUTE 40
- The Nature and Substance of Man—LEO HIRSCH 42
- No Need for Apology—WILLIAM P. JENKINS 45

THE STUDY TABLE—
- The Vatican and the Kremlin—PHILIP SCHUG 48
- Well-Timed Publication—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 49
- A Pioneer Giant—CHANNING M. BRIGGS 49

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Kafka Replies to Schug—D. KAFKA 50
- Wordmongering—GLENN P. TURNER 50

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 51

THE FIELD—
- Dissenting Opinion of Justice Hugo Black 38

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion.

Dissenting Opinion of Justice Hugo Black

"Here again as in Brerd V. Alexandria, decided this day, my basic disagreement with the court is not as to how we should explain or reconcile what was said in prior decisions but springs from a fundamental difference in constitutional approach. Consequently it would serve no useful purpose to state my opinion in length.

"At the outset, I want to emphasize what the crime involved in this case is, and what it is not. These petitioners were not charged with an attempt to overthrow the government. They were not charged with non-verbal acts of any kind designed to overthrow the government. They were not even charged with saying anything or writing anything designed to overthrow the government.

"The charge was that they agreed to assemble and to talk and publish certain ideas at a later date: the indictment is that they conspired to organize the Communist Party and to use speech or newspapers and other publications in the future to teach and advocate the forcible overthrow of the government.

"No matter how it is worded, this is a virulent form of prior censorship of speech and press, which I believe the First Amendment forbids. I would hold Section 3 of the Smith Act authorizing this prior restraint unconstitutional on its face and as applied.

"But let us assume, contrary to all constitutional ideas of fair criminal procedure, that petitioners although not indicted for the crime of actual advocacy, may be punished for it. Even on this radical assumption, the only way to affirm these convictions, as the dissent of Mr. Justice Douglas shows, is to qualify drastically or wholly repudiate the established 'clear and present danger' rule. This the court does in a way which greatly restricts the protections afforded by the First Amendment.

"The opinions for affirmance show that the chief reason for jettisoning the rule is the expressed fear that advocacy of Communist doctrine endangers the safety of the re-

(*Continued on page* 47)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVII JULY-AUGUST, 1951 No. 3

EDITORIAL

It would be a great mistake for Unitarian Ministers to allow themselves to be regimented, and it would be a still greater mistake for them to fall for the temptation to regiment themselves. A Code of Ethics as a record of the commonly regarded best practices of a profession at a given time, and as a guide for those who need it, is to be commended. But a code with penalties attached and with machinery for enforcement may easily become a chain around the neck of progress, and reduce practice to the lowest common denominator. Moreover, Codes of Ethics usually have to do only with the more obvious practices of a profession, and do not reach the more subtle and delicate relationships of professionals to each other and to their clients. Ardent advocates of regimentation may engage in the most unprofessional conduct toward their fellows and the institutions they serve, and no code can reach them. A sensitive and enlightened spirit is the only sure guaranty of professional conduct. The fact that labor unions have enforceable rules and regulations, and that the American Medical Association has a code and blackball machinery for enforcement, is no argument for regimenting Unitarian Ministers. The relationship of ministers to each other and of ministers to churches is not comparable to labor union situations, and the practice of the American Medical Association would hardly be a good example for a profession where independence has been cherished and honored. It would be difficult to imagine a William Ellery Channing or a Robert Collyer, a James Freeman Clarke or a Jenkin Lloyd Jones submitting his conscience in the matter of spiritual ministrations to the majority vote of a Ministers Association in Annual Meeting assembled. There will always be ministers who are jealous of other ministers, particularly of former ministers of their parish, and there will always be parishioners who feel a special attachment to former pastors. And these situations will always cause strained relationships, but they cannot be dealt with in any formalized way. Only broad tolerance and sympathetic understanding can do the job. Regimentation by means of a seemingly harmless but enforceable code is like creeping paralysis—once started it is difficult, if not impossible, to stop. No local church, nor even the American Unitarian Association, much less the Ministers Association, should be empowered to tell a Unitarian Minister what he may and may not do in the area of his competence in responding to the spiritual needs of any human being.

Curtis W. Reese.

Make Mine Democracy

J. RAY SHUTE

At the ripe old age of twenty and while still a student at Trinity College, I became a husband and carried home to my surprised parents both a low grade report card and a beautiful co-ed wife. Prior to reaching my majority, I became a member of the Board of Stewards of one of our local Methodist churches with a membership in excess of twelve hundred souls. At twenty-two, I was president of the local chamber of commerce and was considered progressive by many and perhaps radical by others. Certainly I was considered entirely too liberal in my theology, for soon after I began teaching a large men's Bible class our minister suggested that perhaps I would be happier doing something else around the church. I wound up by singing in the choir and working with young people in a capacity in which I could do little to damage their sincere belief in the fairyland of orthodox theology. My early opposition, as well as my more recent experiences, in politics, came primarily from those who considered me dangerously liberal. It is, then, but natural that I have a very deep and confused feeling of shame and that my ego has been materially deflated of late when I am forced to accept, rather reluctantly I assure you, the label of "conservative." Gad! have the times and the people changed that rapidly in a quarter of a century? Frankly, I do not quite seem to know the score and perhaps I have become, in very truth, the proverbial wet blanket. At any rate, I am happy in my liberalism and would not change places with any one I know.

When I was first attacked, years ago, for my liberal views, I fell back on my deep and abiding convictions that democracy as a way of life in both the church and the state was my central commitment and entirely justified my views. I had a feeling then, which has yet to be altered, that the hope of the world is in the spreading of the gospel of Thomas Jefferson and his concept of the democratic ideal. Having enjoyed the blessings of this type of ideology for about half a century, I must frankly admit that I have neither the inclination nor the intention of swapping horses midstream in this exciting and perplexing century of fluid society and terminological warfare. I must confess that I am too comfortable in my own skin and too orientated in American democracy to be interested in new orders or new deals which would materially change, or scrap, both representative government and democracy.

I was naively informed recently by one of our younger liberal ministers that the founding fathers were slave owners, thoroughly undemocratic in their principles, and biased in their capitalistic views. This I readily admitted and I also knew that they used wax candles. However, I reminded my young friend that our founding fathers did one majestic thing that would forever immortalize them in the annals of history. They dared to establish on this continent what has become the greatest nation in all of the history of mankind—a nation conceived in liberty, dedicated to brotherhood, washed in the blood of freedom, and pioneering in the noblest experiment in history. Our founders dared to assert the rights of the individual in the face of a world that still clung tenaciously to the principles of the divine rights of kings and absolutism. Our founding fathers were courageous. They were more than that: they were morally honest. They did not call things by familiar names, to betray the people into following false causes. To them a spade was a spade and people knew what they meant by the terms they employed. How different today, when we pirate a nomenclature to hide our real motives. In these days of front organizations and plagiarized titles we might join a kennel club, only to wake up some morning and find that we are in the bootleg whiskey business. Such words as "liberal," "American," "democracy," and "freedom" need to be rescued from the modern pirates into whose hands they have fallen and are being misused. And such symbols as "God," "religion," and "church", who knows if these terms are now to be considered obsolete? Frankly, I do not seem to be able to satisfactorily define them any more, without first offering a sort of apology or academic explanation in the form of an excuse for employing them. We are really a cockeyed world!

I must make a confession, which, while admittedly not good for my soul, at the same time might conceivably ease my mind a bit. While I am sincerely interested in social action and feel that a liberal attitude must be augmented by action, at the same time I must admit to you that my idea of a central commitment in religion surely must be more than joining a picket line, or working in a political campaign or for other similar projects, worthy though they might well be. Religion, if it has any function in society whatever in these hectic years, must give a moral and spiritual boost to mankind in addition to helping him with his social, economic, and political problems. Materialism is important, that we all know, but of all the institutions that have been designed to help man in his material problems, not one of them of which I have knowledge is attempting to furnish the dynamic for living that the church formerly furnished. Thus, if we push this historic function out of our front doors, then we have abandoned an area of activity on which we once had somewhat of a monopoly. I cannot help but believe that this function is of primary importance, because it is the peculiar and particular function of religion and should be exclusively our province. It is inconceivable that this function could be handled by a governmental agency as can many of our problems in welfare, education, health, and economics. This needs to be remembered.

Many people today have read into "democracy" an entirely new meaning. They glibly give us a translation of the Greek and say: "Here is what it means." Yes, we, too, are familiar with the etymology of the word—that is not the problem. What we are interested in is the application of the ideology in terms of human experience. The new definition, incidentally, is sterile and it is lifeless, too. We are familiar with early democracy—it was not barren. It was a direct, self-corrective method, wherein the individual, not society or the state, was of primary importance. Man created both society and the state, but, in so doing,

he surrendered none of his individual sovereignty. He merely delegated those rights, temporarily and periodically, to a representative and thus arose what we term representative government. However, the delegate, or representative, had no rights *per se;* they were vested in the individuals and by them merely delegated temporarily to their agents. Have we individuals discovered, too late, that in creating the state we have created a monster which, in turn, is to destroy the individual? These are matters of prime importance in these days of changing ideologies.

We should point out here that when individuals created the state they did so as an expedient and it was the instrumentality of the people. No individual has ever had the moral right to delegate permanently his private sovereignty, because it is not his in *fee simple.* It is a heritage—a trust. Not even for a fleeting rendezvous with the harlot "security" has any generation the historic right to surrender, or pledge, the individual freedom and rights of countless unborn human beings. This individual and universal birthright is too precious a commodity to be bartered in the market places of the world. And, regardless of the desire of many to shirk it, each generation has an obligation to its successor in the same sense that we owe a debt to our predecessor. We must not lose sight of the fact that we are but momentary expressions of eternal man, proceeding and progressing through the ages, upward and onward.

The individual soldier who surrenders is a traitor. So is it in society when the individual attempts to surrender his freedom, to violate his obligation, or to market his heritage for the proverbial porridge, saying: "What price for integrity? What for liberty?" When this is done, then the Day of Doom will indeed be upon us. Surely out of the panorama of centuries past, we can now see the answer to this burning question of our generation. Do we not see that freedom, happiness, salvation—everything—are in terms of the individual and that the group, when all is said and done, is but a number of individuals? Jesus beautifully illustrates this point with his simple story of the lost sheep and the ninety-and-nine. When we seek totalitarianism we cannot, with honor, call it by the name of democracy—not even social democracy—for it is the square peg in the round hole. What we apparently need to learn is that we can have the social gains within the democratic framework; we do not have to kill the goose to have the eggs. But we must guard against moral price-fixing in terms of those very social commodities. They are too precious to price out of the reach of honest buyers, whose purchasing power is in the coin of freedom. There are prices too dear to pay—even for heaven!

Too many liberals have seemingly assumed that liberalism is license. It is not. Furthermore, the moral obligations of the liberal are most demanding and even if the old bus does not happen to have an automatic governor on it, we should be drivers with sufficient judgment to know the limitations of the vehicle and the nature of the roads we are negotiating. I am often confronted with the thought that we are muddling in a most calamitous manner and in a time when clear thinking is badly needed more than ever before in our history. Could it be that we have lost our sense of direction? Or, on the other hand, could it be that there is a need for a new direction and some of us fail to see the signs? It would appear that we are in an era of indecision.

Democracy predicates its appeal to the idea that the rule should be of the people—the common people, if you please. It guarantees social equality. And, yet, we are told that the idea of social equality is a legal fiction, regardless of laws, both constitutional and statutory. We are further informed by those whose opinions we respect that the complexities of society are so great that equalitarianism is impossible except on a much lower level and, once that level is maintained for a period of time, that the realignment will continue downward, and so on *ad infinitum.* The Constitution of our country guarantees to all the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but not at the expense of either our fellows or our nation. The desire to enjoy a swim should not, perforce, indicate that we should dam the stream with human bodies in order to construct a lake. Reason should motivate us in our undertakings. When we fight the battles for the common man, for example, we must take due cognizance of the fact that the uncommon man, also, has his rights. When we battle for labor, if we believe in fair play, we must recognize, also, the rights of management. When we treat the sick of body or of mind, we must take due notice, likewise, of the firm and well. All of these ideas remind us forcibly of the fact that human values enter into the picture and that there is no royal road to happiness, success, and progress. Hence, we cannot say that this method or that is the solution, for they are not. We can only progress by experimentation and the very plan that we adopt today will be outmoded tomorrow. Equalitarianism, like utopia, forever eludes us and is as much a dream as is the orthodox idea of heaven. Perfection is not for man. Man is born into this life one by one. He develops individually and dies one by one. The idea of a generation, or an age, or an era is but dealing with abstractions: they are never born to live an allotted span and then to die at a specific time. We deal only with individuals.

The most anomalous situation in our day, it seems to me, is the liberal who rejects totally the idea of orthodox theology, but who unhesitatingly grasps an economic, social, or political ideology purporting to duplicate the same ultimate notion. It does not make sense. We know that humans are equal only in death and all efforts at amalgamation and equalitarianism in the end result in the antithesis, rather than the synthesis, of liberalism and democracy. We must fight constantly for equal rights and opportunities for all, knowing full well that the end-results will vary and that freedom of thought and action will only tend to demonstrate the legitimacy of variety in human life. And a classless society will only result in a society without class, in the vulgar sense of that term. Mankind's continual problems are not to be resolved by magic any more than by prayer and fasting. Consequently, any change of government or of the economic or social orders will constitute nothing more or less than a temporary lull in the battle for freedom. The battle is a long and difficult one and will never be perfectly concluded. It is ours to continue to fight for gains and continuous progress at all costs—that is the duty of liberalism.

There is a fallacy of tremendous magnitude being injected into liberalism these days. It is the idea that

freedom is a civil right to be shared equally by any and all comers. No idea was ever more erroneous. A democracy can grant to every citizen the liberty and right to pursue freedom, unhampered and unrestricted. But it is up to the individual to achieve his own freedom. This is what I understand the term "salvation by character" to mean; the constant striving and learning and struggling upward and onward toward freedom. Is this not the goal of free men, who are guaranteed the right to go forward under the banner of democracy? Is this not the cornerstone of the liberal faith? Is this not our directive? I think it is. The democratic way of life should guarantee to every citizen freedom from want, disease, fear, intolerance, discrimination, ignorance, and poverty. However, when we have this guaranty and we are given the additional freedoms of the Bill of Rights, what then? Are we to ask that we be granted freedom from personal responsibility and from human drive and ambition? I hardly think so. Whenever we lose the drive and ambition that so animated our forebears, then we have lost the pearl of great price. Any ideology that would beckon us to lay down our tools and let Uncle provide the income leads only to catastrophe—we all know that. And this idea of dividing the wealth—if I am any judge, we now have such a plan in our federal income tax schedules and it aims at redistribution. Our people have gone along on these programs and have indicated a real spirit of cooperation. Have we not made real progress?

I became a Unitarian because I felt that the church was committed to the recognition of the dignity and worth of the individual and was continually fighting for this ideal. I got the idea that liberalism was working at the development of free individuals in a free society and that democracy was the bedrock of the church. When I see some of our folk developing a liaison with groups working at cross-purposes with the democratic ideal, it gives me concern for our future. I know that many fanciful patterns of ideological cloth are being peddled in the market places of the world and that many patterns are being held up as superior to democracy. I give this warning: when we shall have deserted democracy then there will be no freedom, no liberalism, no Unitarianism. For me the path is clear. I have no decisions to make. I made that decision many, many years ago and I stick by my guns, in fair weather or foul. When you start dishing out your ideological servings, regardless of the menu or the price, please make mine democracy!

The Nature and Substance of Man

LEO HIRSCH

The supreme question of our world in crisis is: What is man? Upon the answer depend the questions: How ought man to be treated, whether the democratic ideal is valid, whether racial prejudice and religious bigotries ought to be destroyed, whether we should devote our energies to the creation of peace. These are ethical problems now facing and rending the world.

Orthodox Christianity and most of the historic religions relegate man to a secondary status, because they believe that at best man possesses a sinful nature and that he lacks the power and ability to transcend that limitation; and therefore he must rely solely on the direct intervention of a supernatural power to save him. Communism goes much further by denying any spiritual force existing either in the universe or in man and therefore it subordinates man to the power of the state. Fascism and Nazism completely ignore the masses of men, excepting as they minister to the few supermen. Thus they restored torture and slavery, invented genocide, exterminated millions of human beings—six millions of them Jews—and planned and executed total destruction of entire cities under the guise of "strategic bombing."

While it is true that many of the great religious leaders of the past recognized the dignity of man and reverenced the spiritual quality in him, on the whole they subordinated man to the Creator.

It was not until the birth of the social sciences that man's true worth was recognized. In 1923, Freud's *The Ego and the Id* was published. This book with its remarkable revelations completely revolutionized our attitude toward man and our definition of man. In a scientific and objective manner, Freud's studies brought to light that man is made of three internal forces:

(1) The Id consisting of instinct, the inheritances of his animal past, which provides the drive of self-preservation and of self-interest in his life.

(2) His Ego, the self-conscious intelligence with which his life is directed and maintained.

(3) His Super-Ego or sense of relatedness to others, his ever-present conscience.

The Id and Super-Ego are the residents of the subconscious and the Ego is in control of the conscious—the self-conscious area. The Id and the Super-Ego are in constant conflict, as the Id is passionate, forceful, demanding, and desiring, and is willing to take these desires and demands by brute force. The Super-Ego is the moral force and voice forever saying: No, don't do it, evil consequences will result, you will be punished, it will destroy you. The Ego is the arbitrator, the compromiser, the go-between, the balance wheel between these conflicting elements.

The purpose of Freud was to create two new social sciences, viz., psychoanalysis and psychiatry. One was a new method of psychotherapeutic analysis; the other a new medical procedure dealing with mental disorders. While Freud brought to light the dark underworld of the subconscious, while he discovered in man's lower depths the forces that have brought us to the very verge of destruction, he also revealed to us the dynamic and controlling influences of the Ego and the Super-Ego—the supreme and deciding powers of reason and conscience that have the ability to save us. So that for the first time the whole of man was made visible to us. Thus, Freud succeeded in restoring the initiative for the human person and the forces of life, in teaching us how to chain up, sublimate and control the demons we have permitted to run riot, and how to release those divine forces of the spirit that we have thus far so disgracefully imprisoned.

Since Freud's discoveries, modern man sees himself more and more as a fragment or a summit of the universe. Man has become aware that he is a child of the universe and that his own history is an important

chapter in the history of the world. He scrutinizes the world with more interest, more insight, and more hope than ever before. He wants to master it, to rule it, to make it more habitable, to make it yield more and more sustenance for body and soul.

The notion of the person is at the centre of all our human problems. Every philosophy, every religion, every culture has to take up some position here. We need to understand a personality, its nature, its worth, that we may perceive the spiritual forces that emanate from it and give authority to the ideals it possesses. We have no wish to add another theory to the many that have already been suggested. We shall simply try in this essay to bring out the essential antinomy that makes the human personality the most paradoxical of all realities: a being who is simultaneously spirit and body, closed and open, existent and yet to be achieved.

The human person is a composite—a body, mind, and spirit. Spatiality confines him to a small part of the universe; opacity makes him resistant, impenetrable, divided off from others; plurality denies him complete inner unity. But the human person is also a spirit that comprehends space and surpasses time, that is made for understanding and is hence above space, time, force, and matter. Man is indeed the mystery and the miracle of the world because in him is realized the divinity of the spirit, and this spirit brings radically new values into the universe: thought and love, choice and commitment, justice and brotherhood. The person, therefore, exists to unfold the content of humanity, to carry it on and perfect it.

When an individual experiences within himself an act of love—an act that is beyond animal life and its desire for physical survival—when he deliberately chooses that he himself should die so that others might live, then he clearly affirms his faith in his spiritual existence. Then he proclaims that in the spiritual realm love is life, and life is love.

This being, the person, is an end *per se,* an absolute value in himself; and the species cannot *absorb* him, it can but *integrate* by fulfilling. He is, therefore, never a means, either to the species or to the state, or to the universe; he is an end. Man is thus called to enrich himself in body, mind, and spirit by every kind of cultural activity and by gradually establishing his dominion over the world; to possess himself by way of a more intimate activity of mind and will, leading to full self-awareness and self-mastery. So that we must begin to realize that the solution of all our human problems must be wrought through the individual person by looking upon him as an active, capable, fundamental factor in the improvement of the institutions to which he is committed, be it the state, community, an economic system, or a factory, and that social progress follows his spiritual evolution.

From the foregoing we may infer that man is not a thing. The law of gravitation and other physical laws governing his body act on him as they do on other material substances. However, things are impervious to any influence of the external world. There is no life in the rock. A living organism is animate. The other is inanimate. But the physical things which he shares with other animate or inanimate objects are not the characteristically human nature in him. So let us beware and not look upon man as a thing and hence treat him as a thing and exploit his labor and use him as a means to a material end. Hence, labor, the fruit of man's toil, is not a commodity to be bought and sold like merchandise. That is why a labor organization is vastly different from an industrial corporation. One is to protect the human rights of labor and the other is to secure profits for the owners. The basis of social reconstruction then is to achieve the ethical way of looking upon our fellow human beings.

Neither is man a mere animal. It is true, as Freud points out, that within man there is the Id, that every man has an animal nature. He has a bodily organism like animals. He is a sentient being and, therefore, is sensitive to pain and pleasure. Animals know nothing of reality, they possess no moral sensibilities and are not conscious of a spiritual world. But, again, this Id, this animal nature is not the fundamentally human trait in him. Let us beware then not to judge man in terms of his animal wants and satisfactions. If we judge men as being mere animals, the idea of justice does not enter into our treatment of them. Animals are not man's moral equals, and justice is based entirely on moral equality. The weakness of many social reform movements of our day is due to the fact that they do not go beyond the animal needs of man. We must avoid the danger of falling into these two pitfalls of looking at man either as a thing or as an animal. The supremely important question, therefore, that confronts us is: What is the unique and distinctively human nature in man? This question demands a clear-cut explicit answer.

First of all, there seems to exist in man a unique power that transcends the body and its natural desires, call it a soul or a spirit—no longer simply *anima* but *spiritus.* It looks to an interior and spiritual universe made up of thought, reason, and love, of self-achievement through liberty, of relationships, and communion with other persons. Life in its evolutionary development on this planet has brought forth in man a new element which for the lack of a better term we shall designate by the word "spirit." Science is incapable of dealing with this new element because it cannot be seen or touched or heard or weighed or measured. That is the limitation, a grave limitation, of science: that it confines its interests and activities solely to those things that are tangible, ponderable, visible.

The material substances that we all value so highly and that most of us believe to be the be-all and end-all of life, the material elements of civilization, food, clothing, shelter, the tools and machines and other gadgets, are but the media that ought to serve man's higher values, human values, spiritual values; the noblest and most typically human. These latter include the person taken precisely as spiritual—the sole absolute value here on this planet, — and all his activities in the face of things and men. It is this spiritual nature of man that has enabled him to build cities, to develop language, the arts, the sciences, and has given him the ability to form abstract ideas. Therefore, man is above all a *spirit* and if we would help him we must touch him at the point of his spiritual being, which is the basic truth of his being. Hence, no view of man is adequate which does not include the dimension of the spirit. Man is the agent of the creative process, he is the creator of spiritual evolution. So that the greatest service we can render others is to spiritualize them, to make them aware that they stand in organic, i.e., *spiritual* relations with other human beings. This postulates that there is something unique and precious in every human being and that it is our duty to bring it to light. That this hidden, uncommon preciousness exists is the major

assumption of ethics and religion.

Communion with truth, with grandeur, with beauty, with other spiritual persons — there is the innermost heart of man. This is the plenitude at once tranquilizing and exalting, to which man always aspires, often without knowing it. Civilization is the outcome of a spiritual work, it is born of man's need to fulfill himself by bringing the universe to fulfillment. Matter and spirit are everywhere in close embrace, nowhere are they wholly achieved; they are given us so that by humanizing we may achieve them.

To create intelligent, responsible, and generous men in a brotherly and habitable city in the bosom of an ordered and spiritualized universe—that is the work for which man exists and lives.

Every ethical and religious principle, therefore, must submit itself to the test that to live rightly is to live so as to promote and release the best life in others. We must always ask ourselves: How do our acts influence other people. These principles will not make us less attentive to man's physical needs but more attentive. We know today that better homes, a more secure material existence, less emotional tensions, are indispensable means to the unfolding of man's spiritual qualities. The more clearly we see the end purpose of man, the more intensely shall we desire and work for that end. If we really believe that man is a being possessed of infinite worth, how can we be content with anything short of conditions that will make possible the unfolding and flowering of that worth? A man in business will realize that he is in business not primarily to make money but that the real object is to develop his mind and character and also aid in the development of others engaged in that business. For industry is a social process in which every contributory element has rights and duties and all elements have responsibilities to the public.

A new motive force must become the basis of industry if we are to achieve and preserve our ideal of freedom for all. As business and industry are constituted today, material things are considered the product, the end; and the man who produces them is treated as a means to that end. The ethical relation should be exactly the reverse. The human product must be the primary result. Let our guiding principle in business as well as in the other professions be: To work in such a way that the work of the world now and in future generations shall be done better because we have participated in it.

Because we have failed to consider the spiritual dimension of man, our shortsightedness has summoned our higher faculties to be subservient to the lower; the noble function and ministry of the mind have been enslaved to material satisfactions. One of the saddest things in the world is the many checks imposed upon all of man's noble aspirations. Society exists to help man to develop his powers and man upholds and sustains it to be more fully man, to be worthy and freer. Straightway, through a few selfish leaders, it begins to place obstacles to liberty. Economic oppression breeds world-wide misery that deprives a whole people of the elementary conditions of freedom; political oppression unleashes a welter of rivalries, hatreds, and wars; spiritual oppression poisons the very air we breathe, debases the masses, betrays youth, and denies all the very taste of liberty. Because we have ignored man's spiritual nature, because we have failed to develop his higher faculties, the net result turns everything that man creates and invents as a means of liberation into enslaving him. He invents the machine. Immediately his power is increased enormously, his drudgery is lightened or removed, his mastery asserted, and liberation seems to be at hand. The fact is that the machine under private ownership makes his work more inhuman than ever and brings in its train a nameless slavery. He creates the trade union to win the right to protect himself against exploitation—to lead a more human life. The fact is that the union has led to open war between management and labor. As long as man's spiritual nature is neglected and is permitted to lie dormant, so long each attempt at liberation will result in a new slavery.

It is clear then that we need a new concept of man, his spiritual nature, a new understanding of what he is, and how he can fulfill his personality in and through the lives of his fellowmen. Up to now, he has concentrated his main efforts on the domination of the material side of the universe. From now on, he will have to learn to dominate himself by means of his spiritual nature.

For those of us who recognize the spiritual quality in man and who, therefore, perceive the goal to be attained, what course of action is required of us? We ought to be intensely and sincerely enlisted in and identified with all the excellent social movements now under way; in the movement for Slum Clearance, and Better Housing, for the Minimum Wage, for the Abolishment of Unemployment, for the Elimination of Racial and Religious Prejudice, in the Fight Against Tuberculosis and Cancer and other fatal and preventable diseases. We must put forth every effort privately and collectively to secure these basic improvements. We ought to do everything within our power to bring mental salvation to the unskilled workers by granting them adult education and giving them the fullest opportunity for the development and mastery of a skill.

But beyond all these improvements for better external conditions, we should never overlook the ultimate goal —the aspiration to achieve organic democracy in our industrial life. Society as organized today is not as yet an organism that applies to the individual parts as well as to the whole. We must first plan and build the bridge of Constitutional Government of industry, before we can have organic democracy. If we truly believe that political democracy upholds the worth and dignity of man, why in Heaven's name then do we continue to defeat and postpone every effort to obtain industrial democracy? When are we going to understand that we can never realize political democracy without at the same time obtaining industrial democracy? This basic moral question cannot be ignored and evaded and confounded. It is the fundamental issue of our time.

Therefore, we have a three-fold task before us:

(1) To participate in the socially progressive movements.

(2) To release in all the workers their creative mentality, so that they can take part in perfecting their social function.

(3) To work toward organized democracy by incorporating Constitutionalism in industry.

These revolutionary changes will take time, patience, and perseverance until they are achieved and become effective. In the meantime, millions of innocent men will perish. How are we who are the privileged and live on the so-called upper levels to conduct ourselves toward this agonizing, unsolved problem? What can we do to prevent the death and destruction of these helpless humans at some future time? We can contribute on the upper level to solve the problem of those unfortunates on the lower level. We can organize our human relations in such a way as ultimately to bring

into realization a nobler civilization. The greatest contribution that each of us can make is to value our spirit more than our body—we can contribute a regenerated personality. We can begin to apply the principle of organic cooperation on a national scale, as already achieved in the Tennessee Valley Administration, so that it will penetrate all our schools, colleges, and professions. We can attach a sacred quality to the giving of our word, to speaking the truth, to the binding nature of our contracts and promises. Through this individual development on a world-wide scale, it will be possible to build a collective public conscience which will give it the spiritual power to control the material forces that are at its service and thus create the ascendancy of spiritual over material values. We can surely test our own human quality by looking organically on those with whom we are already related and associated. We can put a quality of the spirit in everything we do, thus contributing to the spiritual evolution of man.

What a world it will be when recalcitrant man will evolve into the *responsible man!* Then we shall joyously exclaim: "What a creation in which there are beings whom we call men and women who have grown into spiritual maturity and who possess *within themselves* the very power that we call God!"

No Need for Apology

WILLIAM P. JENKINS

I suppose like most people I have always thought that my mother was a good cook. I have had that opinion vindicated by others outside the family circle who were not subject to the prejudices of the family. One dish that I became particularly fond of long ago was pie, and I think my mother makes a very good pie. However, there have been very few occasions when she baked a pie that she did not apologize for it. I think this is not uncommon. I am sure all of you have had similar experiences, and some of you who are cooks undoubtedly do the same thing. You apologize whenever you do something well. When someone compliments you for doing something well you tend to say, "It wasn't so good," or, "I made this mistake or could have done this instead." We apologize. I notice that this happens in other areas of life as well. Every now and then someone telephones me or speaks to me in person beginning with the phrase, "Not that my opinion is really worth anything, but—," and then goes on to state a very valuable opinion. Or someone will say, "I have no right to be taking up your time with my views, but I should like to say this." In certain organizations that I belong to outside of church life, organizations dealing with international affairs, for example, someone will get up in the audience and, before disagreeing with the speaker, or in the course of raising some important question, will apologize for the fact not only that he is speaking, but that he is even there; that he is so presumptuous in the presence of the great. We apologize for our best and our most solid opinions.

Now I suppose many of us disregard this as being of no significance. But I believe that this kind of apology is evidence of a very deeply rooted attitude, what we might call almost an inherent part of our human nature as we now know it. I believe it is a symbol of much that is wrong with life and with the world today. When someone apologizes for an achievement, we sometimes say, "Oh he's fishing for a compliment," and we pass it off in that way. But this very idea of fishing for a compliment gives testimony to a deep-rooted feeling of inadequacy in the person who needs a compliment. One who goes around seeking compliments is one who has something deeply wrong inside himself, who has a feeling that he is not a good person, that he is not a capable individual, and that he needs continually to have somebody tell him he is.

When someone makes such an apology for baking a good pie, or giving a good opinion, or for some other achievement, we say, "That's just humility. Humility is a good thing." In its place perhaps humility is a good thing, but are we not really saying that this person is suffering from a sense of sin, a sense of guilt, a feeling that he is not worthy of being able to do anything good, that this humility that we honor and sometimes praise is actually evidence of something seriously wrong inside ourselves? What we are sometimes more likely to say is that this person is expressing a false humility when he apologizes, and all too often that is the case. We say he expresses a false humility which is evidence of conceit, yes, but what is at the root of false humility and conceit? Is it this same sense of inadequacy, or, if it is not that, is this expression of a false humility a device that we use to satisfy something in society that is demanded of us? Society does not like it when we admit that we can do something well. This fault is at the very root and at the very heart of our society. It is not proper for anyone to admit that he has accomplished something good. If a man achieves things and shows some pride in his achievement, we try to knock him down. That again shows a weakness in our society. A society which demands from its members that they continually apologize for their goodness is a society which has something wrong with it, too.

Even so there would perhaps be no reason for talking about this, there would be little significance in this if it were only related to mother's pie and a few mildly expressed opinions. But this is a symbol of something much more serious, because this very attitude that is expressed by our apologies is an attitude that has dammed up a great deal of human ability. This sense of inadequacy that has been cultivated in our social life and in our individual life has frustrated, held back, dammed up a great deal of ability that might have been used for the furtherance of a human cause. Dr. Edwin Wilson has told me of a university professor he knew, a man of great accomplishment, one of the leaders in his field of endeavor, who never wrote anything down. He was always writing a book, but the book never appeared, and this man was not lazy. He was known as a vigorous, active man, but he had something inside him that would never allow him to write down his ideas. A number of his pupils have written books which have been acclaimed. He could have written better books, because his were the original ideas, and yet he never wrote, and society is the worse for it because he did not feel adequate to write. His ability was dammed back by this sense of inadequacy, this sense of guilt,

of not being worthy, of not being good. There are many, many like him. Talk to any professor at any university, and he will tell you of students who are in the same situation.

Then again there are a great many people who cannot get up on their feet and say what they mean. Whenever they try to put anything into words they stumble around or use long involved sentences that have little meaning and little basic sense, because they are trying to cover up this sense of inadequacy. I have often wondered how many inventions, mechanical and social, have been lost to humanity because of this feeling of individuals that they were not capable, that they were not worthy. How many inventions have been lost because of this frustrating paralysis? One might say that we have been flooded by inventions in the last one hundred and fifty years, but anyone who looks at the state of the world today will think that we can do with many more, certainly in the field of social invention. All of this is not to say, of course, that no achievement has been made. Some people have achieved much. There are a few people who have not suffered from this sense of worthlessness, but on the other hand much of what has been achieved has been the result of what the psychologists would call a neurotic compensation drive, a neurotic drive of a person who feels so inadequate that in order to prove that he is not he goes all out in the other direction. Such people are very unhappy people, and often in their race for achievement cause a great deal of unhappiness to others. So much of this attempt to prove one's worth is driven into channels of money-madness or of anti-social inventions that it has caused a great deal of harm to the human race.

Democracy suffers from this feeling of inadequacy as well. It has been said so often that it hardly needs repeating that democracy can only function well when it is based upon a group of people who are well-educated and who give their fullest contribution to the cause of democracy. But a person who feels inadequate cannot make a very significant contribution to the furtherance of good government and democracy. A person who has this kind of feeling about himself, who apologizes for the opinions he holds, is not one who is well-calculated to make a public leader, nor is he one who is calculated to vote as well as he might at elections.

Cultivating this sense of inadequacy has been a device on the part of some of the ruling classes of society to keep the rest of society in its place. If the ruling politicians can persuade us that we are not adequate to have decent informed opinions, then they themselves can make all the opinions and put them into operation. It is thus so much easier for bad politics to rule the day. If they can persuade us far enough in this direction, we lose democracy entirely. The idea of any dictatorship is based on the notion that most people are inadequate, incapable. It was one of Hitler's frequent expressions that the mass of men were not interested and were not capable of having an interest in government life and in the life of society. They were good for only certain small things. When he had persuaded his people that this was true, all hope for democracy in his country was lost.

Why, then, do we do this? Why do we have this feeling? Why are we afraid to express ourselves? Why are we apologizing for the creativity of our hands and our brains? Certainly a large measure of this stems from our Puritan background and from the long development of a Christian sense of sin; for if it is true, and I think to a large extent it is true, that our civilization has been influenced and moulded by the Christian religion, then that has had some strong part to play in this sense of inadequacy. Any faith which founds itself first and foremost upon the idea that man is depraved, is bound to cultivate a sense of inadequacy and worthlessness in every individual who takes that religion seriously; and insofar as Christianity has emphasized the sense of sin, to that extent it has crippled human expression and human life, to that extent it has crippled human goodness.

There is the story of Channing who in his boyhood went to church in a neighboring village on Sunday morning with his father, and heard that famous sermon which made Channing a Unitarian. The minister was preaching on the depraved nature of the human being, and emphasized the wormlike qualities of man and the gloomy future that lay before him because of his sinful nature. He emphasized it with every example he could muster, and young William was very dismayed and in a gloomy frame of mind. As he walked out of church he noticed that his father agreed with all the other men he spoke to that this was a very profound sermon, that it expressed a very sound idea, and poor William got into the buggy and sat on the seat looking as though his heart were about to break as they rode along. Then suddenly his father began to whistle, and it flooded in upon him that mankind was not depraved and evil, but that people were good. So he built his life upon that theme, upon the belief that human nature was good.

What Channing had listened to that morning was being preached in almost every pulpit of his country, and it has been preached so long and so vigorously that even now, although the Western world has rejected this belief, it still suffers from its consequences, from this sense of inadequacy that grows out of a conviction of sin, a sense of depravity in one's inherent nature. This concept, of course, arose out of man's long upward struggle, out of his struggle to understand himself, and it took its place in the dualism of nature and spirit that developed in ancient civilization. Certainly there was a time when in a way it served as a moral corrective for men and women who had no better means of understanding their own nature. But this is all, I think, that we can say for this doctrine: that it might have had a part to play, that it might have served some good purpose in the past, but the time has long since come when we must abandon and destroy such evil concepts. The time has come when, with Channing, we must revere human nature and not debase it. Channing said once:

> I do, and I must, reverence human nature. Neither the sneers of the worldly scepticism nor the groans of a gloomy theology disturb my faith in its godlike powers and tendencies. I know how it is despised, how civil and religious establishments have for ages conspired to crush it. I know its history. I shut my eyes to none of its weaknesses in crime; but injured, trampled on and scorned as our human nature is, I still turn to it with intense sympathy and strong hope. I honor it for its struggles against oppression, for its growth and progress, and still more for its examples of heroic and saintly virtue.

We are followers of Channing, followers in the deepest respect in the sense that he expresses his reverence for human nature. But how can we rid ourselves of this plague of worthlessness? How can we rid ourselves of this sense of depravity and sin? I think we can do it first of all by examining history,

by examining the long pageantry of the human race and noting its heroic struggles to improve itself. A nature that was depraved, in the sense that we have been taught in the past, could never have achieved what the human spirit has achieved in its long pilgrimage toward the good life. An examination of history, while it shows many evils, also shows a steady rising of the human spirit over the obstacles before it. Then too we can help by examining ourselves. If we bring out this sense of inadequacy that most of us feel, and face it for what it is, we can overcome it. If we examine our own lives and consider what our aims and our hopes and our aspirations are, we know that they are good, and if we examine our achievements we will find that they are far better than we thought they were. This again can enable us to rid ourselves of this frustrating sense.

Then we need to educate our children, not simply in the sense of formal education, but in our educational processes in the home and in the church and in everyday living. We need to cultivate in our children a sense of goodness, a sense of the ability to create and to achieve, a sense of appreciation for what they can accomplish, and for what others are able to accomplish. When they try to do something that we know is impossible for them at their age and size, we should not say, "You can't do that," but should stand ready to help them when they discover for themselves that they cannot do it, and thus encourage in them a sense that they can achieve many things.

We need also to cultivate more scientific exploration into the human mind and the human motive, we need to further as rapidly as possible those studies of human nature that are now being made in the fields of psychology and psychiatry and social science, for they will reap rich benefits for us in human understanding. And we need, finally, to apply a greater effort in cultivating what Julian Huxley called, "the reserve of the angelic." He says in one of his books, "There is in fact a reserve of the angelic in ordinary people which is unused and even unsuspected, because it does not fit in with everyday ideas, because most of us are subconsciously rather apologetic for such impractical and inconvenient idealism." Is there a way of tapping this reserve of moral power without letting it loose in the form of prejudice or wild fanaticism, moral, religious, or patriotic? On this question we are blankly ignorant. Yes, we are far too ignorant as to how to use that "reserve of the angelic" because we have focused our attention so much on what we thought was a reserve of the demonic or the satanic within human beings. We have been so worried about confronting ourselves and our fellow beings with our depravity and our inadequacies that we have failed to note the "reserve of the angelic," to cultivate it and make use of it. We need by our examination of ourselves and of history, by the encouragement of greater scientific efforts and exploration, and by further education to cultivate this "reserve of the angelic."

There is no need for apology on the part of the human race. There is no need for my mother or your mother or anyone who bakes a good pie to apologize for baking it. There is no need for you or me or anyone else to apologize for the expression of a well-thought-out opinion. There is no need to apologize for the creative efforts of the human race that has done so much in the past and has such great hopes for the future. Our achievement can be great. The achievement of the race can be much greater than it has ever been, and our own achievements can be so much greater than we have ever dreamed that they could be if we will but rid ourselves of these old chains, of these old ideas of the demonic and satanic and the depraved and sinful nature of ourselves. If we see ourselves as pliable human beings with great potentialities, and emphasize those hidden forces within us, then we can truly be creative, then perhaps we can solve the greatest problem that faces us, the problem of war and peace.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 38)

public. Undoubtedly, a governmental policy of unfettered communication of ideas does entail dangers.

"To the founders of this nation, however, the benefits derived from free expression were worth the risk. They embodied this philosophy in the First Amendment's command that Congress 'shall make no law abridging . . . the freedom of speech, or of the press . . .' I have always believed that the First Amendment is the keystone of our government, that the freedoms it guarantees provide the best insurance against destruction of all freedom. At least as to speech in the realm of public matters, I believe that the 'clear and present danger' test does not 'mark the furthermost constitutional boundaries of protected expression' but does 'no more than recognize a minimum compulsion of the Bill of Rights.' (Bridges v. California 314 U.S. 252, 253.)

"So long as this court exercises the power of judicial review of legislation, I cannot agree that the First Amendment permits us to sustain laws suppressing freedom of speech and press on the basis of Congress' or our own notions of mere 'reasonableness.' Such a doctrine waters down the First Amendment, so that it amounts to little more than an admonition to Congress.

"This amendment, as construed, is not likely to protect any but those 'safe' or orthodox views which rarely need its protection.

"I must also express my objection to the holding because, as Mr. Justice Douglas' dissent shows, it sanctions the determination of a crucial issue of fact by the judge rather than by the jury.

"Nor can I let this opportunity pass without expressing my objection to the severely limited grant of certiorari in this case which precluded consideration here of at least two other reasons for reversing these convictions: (1) the record shows a discriminatory selection of the jury panel which prevented trial before a representative cross-section of the community; (2) the record shows that one member of the trial jury was violently hostile to petitioners before and during the trial.

"Public opinion being what it is, few will protest the conviction of these Communist petitioners. There is hope, however, that in calmer times, when present pressures, passions, and fears subside, this or some later court will restore the First Amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society."

The Study Table

The Vatican and the Kremlin

COMMUNISM, DEMOCRACY, AND CATHOLIC POWER. *By Paul Blanshard. Boston: The Beacon Press. 340 pp. $3.50.*

Nothing could be more appropriate as an introduction to this review than the inscription in the Jefferson Memorial in Washinton, D. C.: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Jefferson was not thinking of the Stamp Act nor of any petty irritation thought up by a foreign ruler; rather, he was thinking of the spiritual tyranny of those who make it their life's work to blunt the intellect of man. He was thinking of dictators of devotional life and authoritarians in the realm of the spirit. It is specifically this kind of tyranny that is a basic consideration in Paul Blanshard's latest book.

In the Western world three great spiritual powers are striving for supremacy. Two are authoritarian and dictatorial, and the other may be roughly summed up under the term "democracy." If you take your stand with Communism you are automatically lined up against Catholicism and democracy, and the same pattern of opposition holds true if you take your stand with either of the others. Paul Blanshard attempts to make clear the essential natures of these opponents. To me this book seems to be a bit hurried and somewhat incomplete. The picture of Communism is quite well-drawn. The picture of Catholicism is not quite up to the standard set in depicting Communism, and the picture of democracy is far below the others in quality. A much better title would have been "The Similarities and Differences of Communism and Catholicism with Notes on Their Opposition to Democracy."

In the introductory section Blanshard sets the problem that democracy-loving people have in getting a clear view of Communism and Catholicism. Because we are periodically aware of the struggle that we have with one or the other we are likely to look to the one with whom we are momentarily at peace as our friend. This reasoning is easily reducible to the formula, "The enemy of our enemy is our friend," and as such clearly shows up the error of such thinking. To make clear that the enemy of our enemy (at any one time) may also be our enemy, Blanshard goes on to show the similarity of essential nature and structure shared by Communism and Catholicism. He also shows their differences, but the similarities are more striking.

The structure of Communist or Kremlin power is that of an informal dictatorship. Nowhere in the legal structure of Communism do we find the dictatorial nature of power clearly defined, but it is real nevertheless. It is a dictatorship of a ruling elite, the Communist Party, and at the head of all sits a personal dictator, Stalin. Catholic or Vatican power is much more formally structured. There is not even the semblance of a constitution and no implied natural rights of the Catholic people. It, too, is a dictatorship of a ruling elite, the priestly caste, and at their head sits a dictator with absolute powers that are formally defined in canon law. At this juncture in history the formally structured dictatorship is much weaker than the informally structured dictatorship, but this is not a situation that must be permanent, and the informality of the Kremlin structure may change with age.

Both dictatorships have a similar industry whose sole aim is the deification of the leader, just as was common with Roman emperors. Hitler and Mussolini operated such industries when they were in power.

Both seek by every means possible to control the thought of their people. The Kremlin does so by the ownership and operation of every cultural medium, plus the complete control of all writers, artists, scientists and thinkers. Imprisonment and exile are commonly used in control. The Vatican, likewise, seeks to control every cultural medium. Inasmuch as it does not own the media, it exerts as thoroughgoing a censorship as possible, and by constant repetition and exhortation seeks to control the minds of men.

Both the Kremlin and the Vatican take the attitude that education must be partisan. There can be no such thing as a free public school in their philosophies. In either case every textbook is written to suit the central purpose of the ruling elite and every teacher is closely watched. As Stalin told H. G. Wells in 1934: "Education is a weapon whose effect depends on who holds it in his hand and at whom it is aimed."

Both the Kremlin and the Vatican are careful to manage truth to their own ends. To them there can be no such thing as history independent of their ends. "History" is whatever they decide that it should be, and they constantly write and rewrite it to suit their purposes. The Vatican formally claims the right to define truth, and all Catholics are bound, on pains of ex-communication and "eternal punishment," to believe whatever is so defined. The Kremlin has not yet gone so far as that in its formal declarations, but it is extremely careful to see that its people get only one side of any story that is presented.

Both seek nothing less than domination of all the people in the world, and each has a carefully worked out system of penetration. Both have smoothly working diplomatic corps and teams of agents who work in "foreign" lands. In Europe the Vatican sponsors parallel political parties, labor organizations and cultural groups whose aim is the capture of control. Both the Vatican and the Kremlin are eager to capture control by outbreeding others. Each offers a hierarchy of motherhood medals and honors. The Kremlin supplies cash benefits for mothers of many children.

Such similarities and differences are placed against a democratic background by Blanshard, and in the last chapter he attempts to show what we might do about the threats of each authoritarian system. Essentially his solution is a policy of containment plus the development of the values of democracy to their highest levels. The solution lacks development and careful study and is, it seems, tacked on. There is little evidence that Blanshard sees some of the same philosophical and structural difficulties in Protestant groups that he recognizes in Communism and Catholicism, and he does very little to show the weaknesses of democratic institutions. Nevertheless, he does shape up a real problem that faces us, and he does do a pretty good job of helping us realize that the enemy of our enemy is not always our friend.

PHILIP SCHUG.

Well-Timed Publication

THE LIFE AND MORALS OF JESUS OF NAZARETH ("THE JEFFERSON BIBLE"). *Edited, with an Introduction, by Henry Wilder Foote. Boston: The Beacon Press. 151 pp. $2.75.*

"A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things. . ." No quotation from the sayings of Jesus, or from any other source for that matter, more aptly describes the total lifework of Thomas Jefferson, one of the Western world's greatest champions of religious freedom and Christian morality. The Beacon Press has done literate Americans a great service by issuing a beautiful and compact edition of the renowned Jefferson Bible.

Edited, with a charming Introduction, by Henry Wilder Foote, this volume is another striking reminder of what a truly remarkable person our third president was. At a time when religious obscurantism and absolutism are again riding herd on the troubled emotions of a frightened democratic society, it is good to have it recalled to our attention that in an age when similar sectarian convulsions were throbbing in the nation Jefferson could sit in calm concentration over his New Testament texts and methodically compile what was for him the core of the life and morals of Jesus of Nazareth.

Hysterical and unrestrained criticism of our presidents (while in office) has been a favorite American pastime since the beginning of our republic. Jefferson was no exception. He was lambasted and pilloried by his political opponents in merciless fashion, with special emphasis on what his screaming critics called his "atheism" and "anti-Christian heresy." This, of course, was nothing new to Jefferson. When, as a bright-eyed young member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, he had tried to secure legislation permitting the emancipation of slaves, he took his first dose of hysterical defamation. After the Declaration of Independence, he returned to the Virginia legislature and proposed the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church. After what he called "the severest contest in which I have ever been engaged" his goal of disestablishment was achieved. Next he drafted his Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, abolishing all the old blue laws against heresy and legalizing the great principle of the separation of church and state. The storm broke. It took from 1779 to 1786 before Jefferson, with the support of many of that extraordinary group of men then in public life in Virginia, witnessed the making of a statute which became fundamental in American thinking at least up until comparatively recent times. Now that the question of church-state separation has again become a matter of bitter controversy, the issuance of a new edition of the Jefferson Bible is particularly well-timed.

Jefferson pasted together the original scissor clippings of his narrative account of Jesus' life and morals, sans miracles, sans supernaturalism, sans everything which offended his reason, while he was president. This is one of the most delightful and stimulating facts of history. The mental picture of President Thomas Jefferson, after a frustrating, burdensome day as the chief executive of a badgered new nation, sitting quietly in the evening, pouring over his four language gospel texts, carefully clipping and pasting, is a memorable experience in the vicarious enjoyment of history.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

A Pioneer Giant

EDUCATION OF MAN. *By Heinrich Pestalozzi. New York: The Philosophical Library. 93 pp. $2.75.*

Pestalozzi is one of the European quartet of great educational philosophers, which includes Rousseau, Herbart, and Froebel. He synthesizes many of the contributions of this group in this collection of his aphorisms. Taken out of context, these aphorisms sometimes appear as incisive comments upon the current scene. However, throughout the small volume there is a good deal of attention paid to the basic fundamentals of his philosophy.

As one of the proponents of an educational scheme which would replace austere authority with supportive love between teachers and pupils, Pestalozzi stands as a pioneer giant. Following his experimental work in his own kindergarten, the entire folk school effort of Austria, which had adopted his method, became the center of attention of the entire educational world. It was a forebear of many of the advances accredited to men like Horace Mann in this country.

Dr. Kirkpatrick, who writes a Preface to the book, states that six principles emerged from the Pestalozzi philosophy. These are: first, that personalities are everywhere sacred; second, that as a little seed contains the design of the tree so in each child is a promise of his potentiality, therefore, the educator only takes care that no untoward influences shall disturb nature's march of developments; third, that the love of those we would educate is the sole and everlasting foundation on which to work; fourth, to get rid of the verbosity of meaningless words Pestalozzi developed his fundamental doctrine of *Anschauung*—direct concrete observation often is adequately called sense perception or object lesson; fifth, to perfect this perception man should learn by appropriate action, "have done with mere words"; sixth, and finally, that apparently out of this demand for action came an emphasis on repetition, never blind repetition, but repetition of action following the *Anschauung*. One cannot help but feel the presence of a very moral, upright man, sensitive to the needs of children around him, speaking from a strong ethical background, always attempting to serve the needs of those people in whose midst he finds himself. The home is central in Pestalozzi's thinking. The love and affection elements receive priority above the head, or the reason. He states, time and again, that love itself is the very essence of education.

Dewey and others, of course, have criticized Pestalozzi's thinking but in so doing merely refined many of the principles of educational philosophy which he followed. The greatest criticism, of course, that one can aim at Pestalozzi, is that man is a natural being and that the moral forces for social reform should come from the natural development of the individual.

His emphasis upon empathy has since been used in many areas and the learning by doing concept has been a part of our educational system for sometime. A quote from page twenty-seven of the book seems to be useful as a summation of his point of view:

> A man may become a thousand things, and a child must be prepared for anything, so say we young folk as we dream of pictures of the humanity we do not know. But in the meantime we do not trouble about the youngster we call Hans, and the boy grows up worthless because we, befogged in our humanitarian dreams, forget the real Hans, whom we set out to educate, and who has in the meantime grown to manhood.

CHANNING M. BRIGGS.

Correspondence

Kafka Replies to Schug

To UNITY:

Recently I happened to read an article by Mr. Philip Schug, which appeared in the January-February issue of your periodical. Unfortunately I am not in possession of further copies and do not know what stand other readers took to the above mentioned article, but so far as I and Dr. Haspl, who is the head of our Czechoslovak Unitarian Association, are concerned, our consciences dictate us to protest against the article and especially against the sentence that runs: "The conference was held to carefully plant and nurture the seeds of hatred and war!" May I ask how he came to this conclusion? Had Mr. Schug lived in our country during the war, when thousands of our best men were put in prison, executed; when villages were pillaged and burned; when civil quarters of our towns were bombed not only by Nazi bombs, but by explosives that were let down from planes bearing the flag with stripes and stars? Does Mr. Schug think that people who passed concentration prison camps, who saw death smile at them, who witnessed the misery of war-stricken areas would let anyone inseminate in their souls seeds of another war? Probably Mr. Schug was right in saying that the conference in Luhacovice was to plant seeds of hatred. But what kind of hatred? *Not* the poison that came out of the pen of Mr. Schug, not the hatred with which his own heart seems to be soaked, but the hatred—a bitter hatred—of war itself, a deep hatred for those mean causes and conditions from which wars spring!

As Christian ministers we are not ashamed of co-operation with the Communists. Why should we not work with those who are really willing to help the common man, who are not hiding themselves behind the shield called liberty or democracy, but who are most earnestly trying to create such conditions as to enable all children to receive proper education, to give the working man—and not only to his boss—the means of good living, good food, good clothing, good shelter, of spending a real holiday at a summer resort—in spas or in mountains—and of enabling his children to spend a joyful childhood—such conditions as deprive man of the fear of unemployment, of misery, and of the endless horrors of war! If Mr. Schug is a Christian and an honest man, I think he ought to welcome such co-operation and not deplore it. Or does he think that it is shameful and unChristian to create better and healthier conditions of living?

I can only advise Mr. Schug to go on with his search for the great values of what he calls "our system of living." I do not hesitate to say that he will succeed. They exist! They are even rooted in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, in the old tradition of the American people. But as all those values become outmoded step by step, especially for some people—as those values are constantly under hysterical attack and are ostensibly pointed out as unAmerican, I am doubtful that Mr. Schug will have the courage to step forward and defend them. If, nevertheless, he will be sincere enough and will be devoted to the real values which were cherished in America, which once made America the land of the free, then he will look at things differently, then he will understand what we are all striving for in this part of the world: *Not war,* meaningless devastation, death of millions, destruction of cities and homes, but a *real peace*: smiling children, flourishing towns and villages, life filled with song, music, laughter, and joy.

This is what leads all of us in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Roumania, the Soviet Union, China, and elsewhere to back the Berlin peace resolution asking for the conclusion of a pact of peace among the Five Great Powers, and what led us to meet a year ago in Luhacovice.

D. Kafka, *Minister,*
Unitarian Church Praha I.
Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Wordmongering

To UNITY:

I like the spirit of tolerance which permits the inclusion of such articles as "Literary Values in Worship" by Kenneth L. Patton in UNITY. It certainly proves that at least some ministers are wordmongers.

With the world getting ready for a third World War because of the lack of a Federal union of the nations, a person who can find the time to write such an article certainly shows that except as some of us clip and keep the article as an example of wordmongering, it will surely find its way back to the pulp mill.

Some one characterized T.R's "a dirty little atheist" as the most compact lie of all time. To characterize the author of the Jefferson Bible as a heretic is just as bad as to say of Lincoln that he was an unbeliever. For of all Americans, he was the great believer in those values which the world is coming to recognize as great. And it did not take the people long to so recognize his words.

What life of Christ must I read to get the picture of him as a winebibber and a gluttonous man? I have personally known hundreds of Jews and not one of them was a winebibber in the dictionary definition of one who drinks to excess. While my Jewish friends know and like good food, I never knew one who could be called gluttonous. I doubt if Jesus was much different from his fellow Jews of the present time.

If Kenneth Patton would take his place with the great Unitarian ministers of the past, he should forsake wordmongering and take up idea mongering. If he would lend his voice and pen to the cause of peace through government—the only sure way—and if he would help the more than 16 million people who want Esperanto as the common language for a literate and democratic world, he could show by example what ministers might be doing.

Yours for World Government with Esperanto *now!*

Glenn P. Turner.
Middletown, Wisconsin.

Starr King School for the Ministry Library is very desirous of securing a file of Unity from February 15, 1937, to the present date. Any help in securing any or all of the files for these years will be much appreciated. Address the School at 2441 Le Conte Avenue, Berkeley 9, California.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

GENEVA SUCCESS

The Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly at College Camp, Wisconsin, on beautiful Lake Geneva, hit the program "jack pot" this year. A harder working and more studious group would have been hard to find. The emphasis on "workshops" in all phases of the program provided for maximum participation by the delegates. Enthusiastic testimonies to the practical benefits received proved that the committee had planned well and that the faculty had functioned effectively.

The resounding ovation given to Dr. Angus MacLean at the conclusion of his six morning lectures only partly indicated the significance of his contribution. The exemplary conduct of the high school camp under the leadership of Rev. and Mrs. John W. Brigham and Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Vetter testified to the excellence of their program. The Alliance morning training session led by Miss Lois McColloch and afternoon workshops conducted by Mrs. Hicks, Mrs. Neuhoff, and Mrs. Taylor kept the women buzzing with ideas all week. Dr. Thaddeus Clark with his novel, modernistic picture of church organization clarified many of the problems and methods of handling them common to multiple group relationships. Rev. Robert Weston interpreted the Bible and Mr. Malcolm Knowles interpreted Unitarianism via the procedures of group dynamics. During their Institute sessions the ministers dusted off many old and new problems. For all who attended it was one of the most instructive and valuable of summer conferences. Even the children had fun.

GENEVA SIDELIGHTS

Marty Clinton, the indefatigable worker and wit from Indianapolis, was editor of the *Geneva Advance*—the daily conference mimeo-sheet news. It was a "busman's holiday" for Marty whose regular work is editing the *Block Booster,* the institutional "slick" paper job of the Block Department Store in Indianapolis.

Edith Sampson failed to show up. Co-op Executive and former Congressman Jerry Voorhis talked.

After a series of allegedly "dull" Bull Sessions masterminded by the men, the Women's Alliance staged a Cow Session, dictatorially dominated by the dames. It was the high point in hilarity for the week.

Financially the conference was solvent but it is fortunate that it is a non-profit enterprise.

SIZE AND SUCCESS

The 318 persons who registered constituted the smallest conference since it was moved to College Camp. The experience of this year would indicate that a conference does not have to be bigger to be better. However, the planning council will do everything in its power to make Geneva "Bigger and Better" next year. Plan now to attend in 1952.

NEW DISPENSATION

At the annual meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference in Evanston last April it was voted to invite the Geneva Summer Assembly to place the administration and control of its affairs in the hands of the Board of the Western Conference. Previous to presenting the invitation to the Assembly, the Board of the Western Conference determined the method by which it proposed to administer the management of the Assembly. The Geneva Assembly accepted the invitation and approved the method suggested by the Western Conference Board. Thus in the future the Assembly will be operated by a planning council consisting of the Conference Executive, ex officio, and nine members appointed by the Board of the Western Unitarian Conference, six of whom are nominated by the Assembly. The Assembly created a By-laws Committee to revise the By-laws and bring them into line with the new arrangement. The members of this committee are Mr. Darrell Snyder, All Soul's, Indianapolis, Chairman; Mr. Melvin Mather, Third Church, Chicago; and Randall Hilton. Acting on instructions from the Board, the Executive Committee of the Western Conference has appointed the following to be the planning council for next year's Geneva Assembly:

Rev. Philip Schug, Lincoln, Nebraska
Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois
Mr. Howard Hauze, First Church, Chicago
Mr. Darrell Snyder, All Soul's, Indianapolis
Rev. John Brigham, Sioux City, Iowa
Mrs. Bernard Heinrich, Third Church, Chicago
Mrs. D. Gilman Taylor, Minneapolis
Mrs. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois
Mrs. B. A. McClellan, Minneapolis
Randall S. Hilton, ex efficio.

Registrations ($5) for next year's Geneva Assembly are being accepted. Send them to Mrs. Esther L. Heinrich, 529 So. Grove Street, Oak Park, Illinois.

WESTERN CONFERENCE BOARD ACTION

A special meeting of the Board of the Western Unitarian Conference was held at College Camp on Monday, June 25, 1951. In addition to determining the administration of the Geneva Assembly, the following action was taken:

1. It was voted that 2,000 reprints of the Western Conference News as published in UNITY be made available for distribution in the churches and Fellowships beginning with the May-June 1951 issue.
2. It was voted to recognize the Iowa Unitarian Association, the Minnesota Unitarian Conference, and the Michigan Unitarian Conference as sub-regions of the Western Unitarian Conference.
3. It was voted that contact should be made with churches in unorganized areas to ascertain the desirability of organizing other sub-regional areas.
4. It was voted to approve the additional payments made to the Commission on Planning. The Conference had appropriated $500 for the Commission. Its total expenses were $673.54.
5. It was voted to appoint the following as a commission to make a job analysis and description of the Conference executive office:

Sidney Tarbox, Hinsdale, Chairman,
H. Hadley Grimm, St. Louis
Wallace W. Robbins, Chicago
Kenneth C. Walker, Bloomington, Illinois

6. It was voted to appoint the following as the Program Committee for the Centennial Meeting of the Conference to be held in May, 1952:

Rev. Ellsworth Smith, First Church, Cincinnati
Mrs. Julius Krolfifer, St. John's Church, Cincinnati

Dr. E. Burdette Backus, All Soul's, Indianapolis
Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago
Rev. Randall S. Hilton, Secretary, Chicago

7. It was voted to appoint the following as a commission to revise the By-laws:

C. David Connolly, Rockford, Chairman
Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis
Mrs. John W. Cyrus, Omaha

The Board also voted to make certain recommendations concerning the By-laws to the commission.

8. The Board discussed two controversial questions raised by the planning commission at the annual meeting:

(a) Tenure of the officers. It was the unanimous opinion of the Board that there should not be any limitation on the tenure of the officers.

(b) Separation of the executive function from the office of Secretary. With but one dissenting vote, the Board approved the present combination of these offices and opposed their separation. However, the Board did recommend to the By-laws Committee that it should submit alternative proposals for the consideration of the Conference on this question.

WHERE THEY ARE

During the summer our ministers seek seclusion for physical recreation and mental stimulation. It is not known where all of them are now but what is known is that the following have spent some of their time in these places:

Adams, James L. (M.T.S.)—Brook Farm, Massachusetts
Aman, Rex (Quincy, Ill.)—Northern Minnesota
Argow, Waldemar (Cedar Rapids)—Massachusetts
Backus, E. Burdette (Indianapolis)—California
Borgford, H. I. S.—New York City
Bradley, Preston (People's, Chicago)—Europe
Brigham, John W. (Sioux City)—Massachusetts
Cyrus, John W. (Omaha)—Maine
Foote, Arthur (St. Paul)—Maine
Gaebler, Max (Davenport)—Glencoe, Illinois
Gilmartin, Aron (Ft. Wayne)—New York, Massachusetts
Hammond, William (Grosse Pointe)—Colorado
Hayworth, John R. (Unity, Chicago)—Canada
Henriksen, Alfred (Iowa City)—Tennessee
Jack, Homer A. (Evanston)—Yellowstone Park
Land, Leon (Flint)—New York, Massachusetts
Marley, Harold P.—Michigan
Mendelsohn, Jack (Rockford)—Massachusetts
Mondale, Lester (Kansas City)—Ozark Mts., Missouri
Olsen, Arthur (Toledo)—Europe
Pennington, Leslie (First, Chicago)—Vermont
Pullman, Tracy (Detroit)—Northern Michigan
Reese, C. W. (Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago)—Kentucky
Robbins, W. W. (M.T.S.)—Maine
Smith, Kenneth (Duluth)—Indiana
Walker, Kenneth (Bloomington, Ill.)—Maine
Weston, Robert (First, Louisville)—Virginia
Westwood, Arnold (Urbana)—Rhode Island.

GAYNOR HILTON

Many have inquired concerning the health of Gaynor, daughter of the Conference Secretary. An exploratory cardiac operation on May 17 revealed an inoperable condition. She returned to the hospital on June 5 with a respiratory infection. Her condition has improved, although she will be in the hospital a while longer.

THINGS TO COME

Sept. 22, 23—Geneva Planning Council, Chicago
Sept. 24—Western Conference Board, Chicago
Sept. 30-Oct. 7—Minneapolis Church Dedication Minnesota Conference
Oct. 15-19—General Conference, Montreal
Oct. 26-28—Iowa Association, Omaha
Nov. 5-7—Prairie Group, Marquette Park

MacLEAN PAMPHLET

The pamphlet, "Planning the Religious Education Curriculum," by Angus MacLean (50c), which was ordered for Geneva but did not arrive, is now available at the Conference Office. Send your order now.

SUMMER EXPERIMENTS

The Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago, continued its services through August fifth. During the month of July the congregation was addressed each Sunday by a different speaker. Coffee hour and discussion are held following the service.

The Channing Club of the First Unitarian Church, Chicago, is sponsoring a series of weekly suppers, vespers, and discussions on Sunday nights. These will continue through August.

SERVICE COMMITTEE MISSIONS

A number of persons from the Western Conference area are going on various Service Committee Missions this Summer. They may be of some assistance on Service Committee programs during the coming year.

Japan Medical Mission:

Dr. Lauren V. Ackerman, Medical School, Washington University, St. Louis
Dr. Charles G. Johnston, College of Medicine, Wayne University, Detroit
Dr. Maurice Seevers, Medical School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Dr. Malcolm H. Soule, Medical School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Japan Engineering Mission:

Prof. Charles W. Beese, Tech. Ext. Div., Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
Prof. Arthur Brownwell, Northwestern University, Chicago
Prof. William Chedsey, University of Illinois, Urbana
Dr. Ford L. Wilkinson, Pres., Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, Indiana

Child Care Institute, Germany:

Dr. Hyman S. Lippman, Psychiatrist, Minneapolis
Mrs. Bryce Shoemaker, St. Paul

Public Health Mission, Germany:

Prof. Earnest Boyce, Engineering Dept., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Dr. Henry H. Work, Jr., University of Louisville, Louisville

Dental Mission, Germany:

Dr. L. Ruch Bailey, School of Dentistry, University of Indiana, Indianapolis
Dr. Maury Massler, College of Dentistry, University of Illinois, Chicago
Dr. Arthur L. Roberts, Dentist, Aurora, Illinois.

The Conference Office will be glad to help in any way secure further information, more complete addresses, and in scheduling dates for any of the above persons.